

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/567,437	02/07/2006	Hideyuki Ueda	043888-0444	8476	
53080 MCDERMOT	7590 09/18/200 T WILL & EMERY LL	EXAMINER			
600 13TH STI	REET, NW	•	HAN, KWANG S		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005-3096		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1795		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/18/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/567,437	UEDA ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Kwang Han	1795		

	Kwang Han	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth a ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	ED WITHIN TW
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of variety of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extel Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further control (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:		
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see comments below. 		condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795	/Kwang Han/ Examiner, Art Unit 1795		

Applicant's remarks are as follows: 1) The Dohle reference fails to disclose that the second flow path has an inlet into which air is introduced and that the effluent is directed to the prouse sheet without being mixed with the air, and 2) Grot prener fails to disclose that "the effluent discharged from said anode is passed through said porous sheet and discharged from said outlet". The Dohle reference clearly discloses an intellet for where air is introduced as shown in Figure 1 and discussed in the office action. The Applicants assertion that because the second flow path provides oxygen for the cathode of the fuel cell, the effluent from the anode is mixed with air is incorrect. It is well known and obvious to one of ordinary skill that the oxidant flow path for a fuel cell is separate from the fuel supply path and would not intersect. As discussed previously in the office action Dohle is silent towards a porous sheet provided for the cleaning device on the waste line (2). Dohle further discloses the anode waste gas comprises primarily CO2, water vapor, and alcohol [0020]. The Gott reference is provided to teach the use of diffusion layers on catalysts (electrodes, cleaning device) to permit diffusion and dispersion of reactant gas to the catalyst layers. The apparatus of Dohle modified by the teachings of Grot would meet the limitations of the claim since the effluent provided in the waste line would pass through a diffusion layers or of the output of the ordinary skill waste line would pass through a diffusion layer or or the output for the output of the ordinary skill man and the ordinary skill are the ordinary skill are the ordinary skill are skilled to the ordinary skilled the ordinary sk